

LABOR RELATIONS & EMPLOYEE SERVICES COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 11, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Cushing called the LRES Committee to order at 1:00 p.m. in first floor conference room of the Oneida County Courthouse. It was noted that this meeting had been properly noticed in accordance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law and meets the Americans With Disabilities Act.

LRES COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Sonny Paszak, Billy Fried, Ted Cushing and Scott Holewinski.

LRES COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Carol Pederson (excused)

ALSO PRESENT: Lisa Charbarneau, Linda Herrmann (Labor Relations/Employee Services); Margie Sorenson (Finance); Brian Desmond (Corporation Counsel); Sheriff Grady Hartman, Dave Kroll, Terri Hook, Kim Adams (Sheriff Dept.); Freeman Bennett (Highway); Brenda Behrle (Clerk of Courts); Tammy Walters (Veteran Service); LuAnn Brunette (Buildings & Grounds); Larry Mathein (Medical Examiner); Mike Romportl (Land Information); Jonathan Anderson (Lakeland Times)

APPROVE AGENDA

Motion by Paszak, second by Fried to approve the agenda for the present meeting. All ayes; motion carried.

APPROVE MINUTES

Motion by Holewinski, Second by Fried to approve the minutes of February 26th as presented. All ayes; motion carried.

BILLS, VOUCHERS & LINE ITEM TRANSFERS

Motion by Fried, second by Paszak to approve the bills, vouchers and line item transfers as presented. All ayes; motion carried.

CREATE A PART-TIME SOLID WASTE TECHNICIAN

Freeman Bennett explained that they have down sized the amount of permanent employees at Solid Waste and replaced them with LTE employees that can only work a certain amount of hours per year. He said they were running out of hours and would like to take one of those individuals and put him into an 80% part-time employee position.

Charbarneau stated that the Buildings & Grounds and Solid Waste Committee did approve the position yesterday at their meeting.

Motion by Paszak, second by Holewinski to approve the creation of an 80% Solid Waste Technician as presented. All ayes; motion carried.

RESOLUTION: SOLID WASTE TECHNICIAN

Motion by Holewinski, second by Paszak to approve the resolution to create an 80% solid waste technician position and forward to County Board for their approval. All ayes; motion carried.

RESOLUTION: SHERIFF WAGES 2015-2018

Motion by Fried, second by Paszak to amend the resolution for the Sheriff on line 32 and for the Clerk of Courts resolution on line 28 to say "follows the going rate for the employees". All ayes; motion carried.

Motion by Holewinski, second by Cushing to approve the resolution for the Sheriff Wages for 2015-2018 with changes and forward to County Board for approval. Roll call vote with Fried voting nay; Paszak, Holewinski and Cushing voting aye. Motion carried.

RESOLUTION: CLERK OF COURT WAGES 2015-2018

Brenda Behrle asked the Committee one more time to reconsider the wages for 2015-2016. She stated they have millions of dollars coming through their department. She stated that other counties are giving 1-1/2% across the board or 1-1-2-2 and she would like the Committee to reconsider some percentage for the first two years out of respect or entitlement, fairness.

Lisa Charbarneau confirmed that the Treasurer, County Clerk and Register of Deeds received 0% for 2015 and 2016.

Motion by Paszak, second by Cushing to approve the resolution for Clerk of Court Wages with changes and forward to County Board for approval. Fried votes nay; Paszak, Holewinski and Cushing voting aye. Motion carried.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Motion by Fried, second by Paszak to adjourn into closed session pursuant to section 19.85(1) (c), Wis. Stats., to: "consider employment, promotion, compensation or performance evaluation data of any Oneida County employee" (Topic: Letter of Agreement, re: Retirement Health Insurance); and section 19.85(1)(f), Wis. Stats., to "consider financial, medical, social, or personal histories or disciplinary data of specific persons, preliminary consideration of specific personnel problems or the investigation of specific charges, which, if discussed in public would likely have an adverse effect on the reputation of the person referred to in such data" and section 19.85(1)(g), Wis. Stats., "for purposes of conferring with legal counsel concerning strategy to be adopted by the governmental body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved." (Topic: Discrimination Complaint and Carlson-Dettmann Contract)

Roll call vote with all voting aye; motion carried.

Discussion held in closed session.

Motion by Holewinski, second by Paszak to return to open session. Roll call vote taken with all voting in the affirmative; motion carried.

Motion by Holewinski, second by Paszak to accept the letter of agreement for health insurance at retirement as discussed in closed session. All ayes; motion carried.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL

Lisa Charbarneau explained that at the last meeting the Committee asked her to put together a proposal and timeline for the performance evaluation system. She proposed a committee of ten members.

Billy Fried thought it would be more productive with a smaller group. She explained that she wanted it to be big enough that they got input from all the different divisions of the County.

Motion by Holewinski, second by Paszak to direct the Human Resource Director to follow through with the Performance Enhancement System as presented. All ayes; motion carried.

COMPENSATION PLAN (Concerns from employees)

Lisa Charbarneau explained that when they implemented the plan there were things that came up at the last meeting and the Committee asked to put some numbers to it so they could see what the actual fiscal impact would be. She provided the Committee with a list of considerations. The first one involving four individuals were people going in at the control point on their wage schedule but their increase is about 1.2 cents. The implementation for the resolution was that anybody below the control point that received less than 15 cents got an additional 15 cents. At the control point and above they did not. Charbarneau stated that if they wanted to change that they would have to do a resolution.

Charbarneau said in the next group there were people from January 1st to January 21st that were eligible for step increases and received them. From January 22nd until March 1st is the next group of employees who were frozen that had step increases during that time but were not allowed to receive them. She went back and put in if they had received that step where they would have been placed on the new schedule and the total cost of that is \$15,808.46. Those are people that would have had performance evaluations during that window of time when the all the salary schedules were frozen.

The next group is the employees that would have gotten a step under the old plan during the month of March. Had they been on the old schedule and looking at it as this is what they thought they were going to get versus what they ended up getting. The cost for these two individuals is \$6,509.72.

Margie Sorenson reminded the Committee that this is only the annual increase and it is the next year and the next year, and the next year. It continues. They are going to go on the plan and hopefully they meet expectations and go on. She stated this is just one year; add this up every single year.

Grady Hartman asked to speak about his one employee that was being affected. They were expecting a raise in two weeks to \$18.20 but instead were placed on the new wage scale at \$16.85 and it will now take her four years to get to the rate she was expecting.

Margie Sorenson explained that they had talked about some of the problems that their wage schedules had. She said this was one of the wage schedules where their steps were 7 and 8 percent.

Sheriff Hartman said just to argue the other side, the first step was considerably below and we didn't complain when we were under the market for that entire year. Charbarneau explained that part of that was because we provided most of the training and certification once those folks come on board. It really takes almost that full first year to where they are operating at a level we can compensate. Sheriff Hartman stated that several in the past have not made their training and are let go, so you pay them less at the beginning and when you reach the point of competency then you increased it a lot.

Tammy Walters told the Committee that she was one of the people that fell under the old schedule. She would have gotten a step on February 27th, so she was frozen and did not get that step. She stated it has absolutely nothing to do with the money, it is the principal. She did a great job for her veterans, her clients

and she was just as loyal and dedicated to them and to this county as all the other employees that got their steps and got their increase. To her it is 100% about fairness; it has never been about her salary since she has gotten here. She never worried about her salary. She does worry about fairness. She is one of those handfuls of people that fall under that schedule and she feels it would be unfair to not allow them to get that step when they did the same job as every other employee in the county.

Charbarneau stated the last one on the sheet was at the Sheriff's Department and it has to do with how people cover each other for vacations. She said it was the issue that when the payroll person is gone on vacation, the person who fills in, the current policy says that they move up to the next highest rate in that grade level. The person that goes to fill in ends up being paid more than the person who does the job all the time and does all the work. Charbarneau told the committee that one of the solutions they had used in one of the contracts was that when somebody fills in they would either get the starting rate for the position they are filling in at or keep their rate, whichever is higher. It could be a situation where somebody is making more money than the position they are filling in for. You would want to continue their salary at that level while they were filling in for the other position.

Billy Fried commented that he would like to work with Margie and Lisa to see if he can bring this committee a different strategy. With these numbers he didn't know where they would get the money to do it across the board but maybe there is another way they could do it with a stipend or something. He stated they knew when this was implemented there was going to be appeal issues and other things to look at and if they can't do it, they can't do it. They need to digest it and come back with some other options to look at.

Larry Mathein stated that when you put people into a rank, what you do is say that this person's job is pretty much equal in line with this person's job. We consider them some sort of parody. He noticed on the ranking list that when he reviews the people on either side of him, both of those folks are considered to be in the control point. He looks at himself and he was raised up to the minimum. So he looks at the guy hired three weeks before this became effective and he is at or above the control point and that is about \$10,000 more a year than what he makes. The person underneath him is at 9 or \$10,000 more a year than what he makes. This was supposed to help equalize some of these things. He understands they need to draw some lines but he thinks this just needs to be looked at. He doesn't know if that was done when the list was put together but according to this it is going to take him how many years to get to the control point. He stated nothing was going to happen for at least one year and he would like them to consider those kinds of things.

Lisa Charbarneau reminded them that under the appeals process that how you were placed on the wage schedule in your grade level is not appealable.

Margie Sorenson stated that to place people where they belong for their years of service would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars that we don't have. We cannot afford that. We haven't implemented the last two plans that way because it becomes unaffordable.

Ted Cushing reminded the Committee that one reason this got passed at County Board is that this is a framework for us to get started and we can move forward. It is going to get changed, it is going to get tweaked and whatever has to be done to it to make it work. Not everyone is going to be running around with a smile on their face. It is impossible to make that happen, but hopefully we can address these situations so that employees can still feel valued and we can move forward. We are going to get copies of

March 11, 2014

Page 5

the comments and come back at the next meeting and we can all try to think of something that might work.

COMPENSATION PLAN (Implementation clarification)

Lisa Charbarneau told the Committee the next item was the changes they did for law enforcement. In the resolution they increased them to 2080 hours and when she and Margie did the implementation they talked about the fact that based on some of the comments that they were going to be taking these folks and sliding them in at the next highest salary on the 2080. Grady disagreed that it was in the resolution to go to 2080. Grady talked to Brian Desmond and he reviewed the resolution. New action forms were printed based on Brian's opinion of the resolution. She stated the first group of numbers on the sheet was based on what she and Margie thought was the implementation of trying to slot them in at the next highest rate based on talking about the compression issue and going to 2080 was going to be a 6% wage increase.

Grady's argument was that the sheet he prepared and presented to the Committee showed the wages at 1950 and at 2080. His impression was that you knew what that was and that was what you approved.

Charbarneau stated that the point is that it was implemented the way that Brian explained it and if the Committee's understanding of that was different or they want it changed that would have to be changed by County Board resolution because it is in the resolution that was approved by County Board.

Billy Fried asked if the resolution had a fiscal impact statement tied to it. Charbarneau stated there was a fiscal impact statement but it is based on the language in there. The fiscal impact statement was tied to the first method. Fried stated that the only comment on the fiscal impact is that for him, and he was sure for a lot of supervisors, that sometimes you don't read all the words and you are looking at the fiscal impact which is a big part of what you are deciding on.

Margie Sorenson brought up the point that one of the reasons she thought they would implement the first option was because of comments that Scott Holewinski made at the meeting saying these guys aren't going to be getting big raises and things like that. She pointed out that the first person on the list making \$56,889 and with the first option they will go on the plan on 3/1/14 to \$57,818 so that is a thousand dollar increase. If you go to the second method the person is currently making \$56,889 and will bring them up to \$61,672 and increase of \$4500 in wages only. She stated that's why this was done the other way.

Sheriff Hartman stated they are not getting raises; it is going from 1950 to 2080. He said you are acknowledging the fact that they are working more hours. The Committee was acknowledging that there was a compression issue. He stated he believed the committee understood it.

Charbarneau offered to do a history on where they were, what the hours were, when they got changed, what the increases were and they could look at it that way.

Fried stated that if the wrong fiscal impact was attached it needs to be brought back to County Board because it would have changed the way he voted. He asked if anytime a fiscal impact doesn't accurately portray what is going on in a resolution does it void the resolution.

The consensus was to have Corporation Counsel review the resolution to see if it has to go back to County Board.

COMPENSATION PLAN (Appeals process)

Lisa Charbarneau explained to the Committee that employees were told they could get their total number score from Carlson Dettmann but not a breakdown. She told Carlson Dettmann that employees are upset about not getting their broken down score. Carlson said he would basically be writing their appeal for them by telling them what area they are missing. He then said what they could do was have the employee sign off on a waiver to not disclose this trade secret and they could have the broken down numbers. The advice from Andy Smith was that we could proceed with this and allow the employees to do that if the committee so chooses. She asked the Committee if they were okay with her proceeding with the offer after discussing with Charlie Carlson.

Motion by Fried, second by Paszak to approve offering the confidential disclosure agreement to employees as presented. All ayes; motion carried.

WELLNESS/HEALTH UPDATES

Linda Herrmann explained that every year we submit the cost of wellness items to GHT and they have reimbursed us for those costs. For 2013 we received \$8,761.07.

OUT-OF-COUNTY TRAVEL

Lisa Charbarneau requested to attend a risk management meeting in Stevens Point on April 14th.

Motion by Cushing, second by Paszak for Lisa Charbarneau to attend the meeting in Stevens Point per her schedule. All ayes; motion carried.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

March 26	9:30 a.m.
April 09	9:00 a.m.
April 23	9:00 a.m.

FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

Affordable Health Care Act
Compensation Resolution

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Holewinski, second by Cushing to adjourn. All ayes; motion carried.
Meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Ted Cushing, Chairman

Linda Herrmann, Committee Secretary